

# Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee

## Meeting 7 Notes

October 27, 2004

SeaTac Airport Auditorium

### Members & Alternates:

Karen Allston	Gene Eckhardt	Rachael Osborn	Tim Wilson
Bruce Beauchene	Tom Fox	Jerry Peterson	Donald Wright
Randy Black	David Fujimoto	Gary Rhoades	
Ben Bonkowski	Andrew Graham	Steve Skipworth	
Greg Brizendine	Richard Gustav	Denise Smith	
Marla Carter	David Johnson	Debbie Thomas	
Tom Clingman	John Kirner	Frank Triplett	
Lynn Coleman	Kimberly Ordon	Judy Turpin	
Andrew Cook	Bob Pancoast	Dawn Vyvyan	

### DOH Staff & Consultants:

Michelle Austin	Cynara Lilly	Deana Taylor
Rich Hoey	Jim Rioux	
Jennifer Kropack	Richard Siffert	

### Others:

John Kounts	Danford Moore
Doug Levy	

## I. Introduction and Housekeeping

- A. Introduction of subcommittee members.
- B. Alternate member comments will be allowed on each agenda topic. Discussion period will include primary subcommittee members first and then be opened to alternates. Requested that alternates raise hands in order to comment. Facilitator will call on individuals and ask whether or not they have comments. DOH is very much interested in what they have to say.
- C. Rich Hoey outlined the agenda for the meeting.

## II. Meeting 6 Minutes Review

A. Rich Hoey reviewed the Meeting 6 Minutes.

- i. Noted that DOH will avoid creating new terminology.
- ii. Emphasized that DOH is working with the Department of Ecology on watershed planning.
- iii. There were no changes to the meeting 6 minutes.

## III. WUE Program Model Matrixes 1 and 2 – Jim Rioux

A. Jim Rioux presented the MWL Water Use Efficiency Program Model Matrix 1 and 2. He noted that this revised document is based on comments and suggestions he received from subcommittee members. It was noted that he was trying to simplify this document. As a result the number of categories for size was reduced. The current version uses a simple small, medium, large approach based on total number of connections. The breakpoint for small is 1,000 connections following the model used for planning and SEPA. The breakpoint for large is 10,000 connections which is consistent with the 1994 Conservation Planning Requirements.

B. Comments and questions received:

- i. What is the relationship of the two matrixes?
- ii. Variety of terminology is used on both matrixes, such as ‘advanced’ and ‘enhanced’. There should be consistency.
- iii. These matrixes should be incorporated into the rule to be enforceable.
- iv. Matrix 1 footnote states that larger systems have a greater impact on the resource. Change to reflect that the size of the system and the size of the watershed basin are both characteristics that can determine whether or not the system has an impact on the resource and how much an impact it may have.
- v. The categories are too broad, such as the system size. It was recommended that there be sub-categories in the matrix to explain the categories. DOH clarified that water systems will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Request noted for examples of what requirements could look like for different sized water systems.
- vi. Request for examples of what requirements could look like for different sized water systems.

**ACTION:** DOH to provide case examples of various water system sizes on how they may need to address leakage, conservation, etc. in order to meet requirements.

- vii. Does “total connections” refer to ‘active’ or ‘approved’ connections?
- viii. The matrixes appear to be a general accounting system for DOH. It appears that this model does a good job of breaking out the systems with the largest amount of water consumption.
- ix. What about water use? How do these matrixes apply to water use?
- x. Matrix 2 should add a third category for reduced conservation program. This would be used if conservation performance is very good. Wastewater promotes that concept.

#### **IV. Subcommittee Discussion: Conservation Measures – Deana Taylor**

- A. Deana Taylor presented the following documents for the Conservation Measures discussion:
  - i. Conservation Program Concerns Table
  - ii. Conservation Measures Table
  - iii. Conservation Measures Discussion
- B. Comments were made about the Conservation Measures Table document. The headings (CPR, AWWA, EPA, CA, and DOH) are not clear. They are marked with footnotes, but it is not clear which document it is referencing. The ‘sources’ of the data should be clearly laid out.
- C. This discussion focused on:
  - A: Options for Choosing Measures to be Evaluated
  - B: Should any measures be required to be evaluated?
  - C: Should any measures be required to be implemented?
- D. Conservation Measures Discussion sheet was reviewed and discussed by the subcommittee. DOH clarified that the intent of the Table was to present DOH existing guidance, information from other references, and the departments’ initial thoughts.
- E. The subcommittee discussed Section A of the Conservation Measures Discussion Sheet. A question was raised about the authority of DOH to review evaluations and what evaluations would entail. Jim Rioux informed the subcommittee that the issue had been addressed by the Performance Reporting and Accountability workgroup.
- F. The subcommittee discussed options for categorizing measures to be evaluated. The broad general category names should be moved into rule, but the subcommittee requested that “suggested” conservation measures coming from DOH be more detailed in guidance with information about difficulty, costs, and levels of participation needed to get specific amount of water savings.

- G. In regards to what measures DOH should require, some subcommittee members believed education should be required. Other disagreed and stated that just requiring broad education would not be of value. Education would have to be specific and helpful for the conservation measure being implemented and focusing on requiring general education – like brochures – would not be of value. It was noted that DOH is still investigating their authority to require specific conservation measures. Rich Hoey summarized that he was hearing a fair amount of agreement that decisions on individual measures should be left to utilities with guidance from DOH.

**ACTION:** Rich Gustav to provide list of 90 conservation measures being evaluated by the City of Seattle.

- H. Service meters were discussed. The subcommittee seemed to agree that the evaluation of service meters for all systems should be required. The majority of the subcommittee agreed that service meters should be required, but there was not complete agreement.
- I. Option A.3 was favored by a majority of subcommittee members.
- J. Option A.4: The subcommittee believed the Conservation Measures specified would be hard to define.
- K. Option B: These two measures (conservation-oriented rates and reclamation >1,000 connections) are already required by law.
- L. Option B: Should add system leakage.
- M. Option B: Reclamation – small water utilities need to be involved, such as in a community project.
- N. “Reasonable evaluation” – specific. DOH should come out with.

## **V. Public Comment**

Danford Moore stated he supports service meters in larger systems, but feels that in smaller water systems they are unnecessary.

## **VI. Working Lunch**

### **A. Roadmap:**

- i. An updated version was given out.
- ii. The subcommittee’s last meeting will be in February.

- iii. The workgroups will be meeting in November. Information will be sent to the full subcommittee via email prior to the meetings.

Cost Effectiveness Workgroup – November 1, 2004

Process Planning Workgroup – November 5, 2004

Data Collection Workgroup – November 9, 2004

- iv. A draft subcommittee report is targeted to be completed in February 2005.
- v. The Planning Process committee will meet via conference call on November 5, 2004.

**B. Legal Questions:**

- i. The answers to several legal questions posed by the subcommittee were presented.
- ii. If subcommittee members have questions and / or comments, they should be directed to Rich Hoey.

**C. Update – Other Stakeholder Involvement**

- i. DOH has retained Harris & Smith Public Affairs to do additional outreach. Outreach meetings to be held in November and December. There are four areas of focus for the outreach. Feedback will be provided to the subcommittee in December or January.

**VII. Finalize Conservation Measures Discussion – Deana Taylor**

**A. This discussion focused on the remaining options:**

D: How should supply and demand characteristics be incorporated?

E: Identification of selected conservation measures.

- B.** The subcommittee discussed requiring calibration of source and service meters. Some committee members stated that it was unnecessary to create a separate requirement for calibration. Other committee members stated that utilities must have a schedule to maintain meters so that they are in good working order. It was also noted that service meters are not usually calibrated but rather tested and replaced if not working correctly.

**ACTION:** DOH to research whether or not there are any meter testing requirements in other regulations.

- C.** There was concern that DOH was focusing on number of connections more than the other characteristics, supply and demand. It was suggested that all three should be considered equally.

